

CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING

OF THE

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Minutes

A special meeting of the Public Works Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Smithtown, New York, on Wednesday, **May 25, 2005** at 2:00 p.m., to discuss the matter of the Capital Budget.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Allan Binder • Chairman

Legislator Peter O'Leary • Vice•Chairman

Legislator Brian Foley

Legislator Angie Carpenter

Legislator John Kennedy

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Vivian Vilorio•Fisher

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Legislator Ricardo Montano • District #9

Legislator Cameron Alden • District #10

James Spero • Director/Budget Review Office

Sean Clancy • Budget Review Office

Jim Peterman • Department of Public Works

Charles Bartha • Commissioner/Department of Public Works

Leslie Mitchel • Deputy Commissioner/Department of Public Works

Bill Hillman • Department of Public Works.

Alexandra Sullivan • Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano • Court Stenographer

(* THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:15 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

If everyone would stand for the Pledge led by Legislator O'Leary.

SALUTATION

Public Works and Public Transportation Committee will come to order. This is a committee meeting on the Capital Budget. If I could ask the Public Works Commissioner and his entourage to come up to the table and make their presentation.

LEG. CARPENTER:

No entourage?

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Oh, no entourage.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The entourage will follow as necessary.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Okay. I thought maybe they had this feeling about you, something was going. We can talk about it if you would like. We could have a counseling session.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

They're always there backing me up. First, I would like to say that the review by the Budget Review Office was, I believe, fair.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Is that surprising?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Not at all, particularly with Jim Spero as Budget Director. I've been very happy, virtually my entire career, I've worked with Jim across the table, and it's never been anything but fair. It's really been a pleasure working with Jim.

MR. SPERO:

Thanks, Charlie.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Basically the Capital Program as presented by the County Executive is a program that we support and feel that we can execute. And we would seek the Legislature's support of it. Obviously, if there are any questions, we came prepared to answer them.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Are there any questions of members?

LEG. CARPENTER:

No, that's it, we're done.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

We can be done if there's nothing specific.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I want to speak in particular about one particular project.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Charlie, I just wanted to touch base with you on the Fourth Precinct's renovations and improvements. We had talked about that. I know that there was some planning money, I guess, that had been authorized by us by way of resolution earlier this year. Is that something now that you've actually started or are going forward on that?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, we are preparing the RFP, we will be issuing it next month.

The meeting we had last time and the questions you asked have stimulated some conversation with the Exec's Office as to the consideration of an alternate location.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Has that been resolved so that we are now, you know, all on the same page as far as the North Complex?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

It's not resolved yet, but it's moving closer to that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I have a question.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And do we anticipate that's going to be resolved shortly within the time frame that you need prior to the letting of the RFP?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I anticipate it will, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. And if it doesn't, would you share that with me if it's still unresolved before the RFP gets let?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Yes. Absolutely.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Hi, Charlie. There's been some representation made in our work group concerning the repaving of roadways and moving some monies from subsequent years or later years to '06, and the representation made that there was some discussion with you that any monies that were moved, advanced, to '06 that you would be able to accommodate that and get those jobs done and utilize the appropriations. Now, I'm talking specifically about a number •• Jim, is the number five million?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I believe it's Capital Project 5014.

MR. SPERO:

Five million and advancing another five.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Advancing another five? So we're talking ten in '06?

MR. SPERO:

That's correct.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Would DPW have a problem •• because that's a question that came up. You know, if we're going to be advancing five million from '07•'06 for a total of ten million in '06, the representation made was that your department would have no problem completing the various projects to accommodate that amount of money.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

That's true. There are sufficient projects to spend that money on, and we •• there's a minimum •• minimal amount of engineering involved in those projects. It's basically some redrainage and resurfacing. Those are the type that don't involve land acquisition and they have good community support, so they're able to move ahead without delay.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yeah, it's pretty much repaving, correct?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Repaving and some drainage.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And some drainage. I mean, there's a difference between repaving and reconstruction obviously.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Yes. There's no widenings involved here.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Exactly. So the ten million that we are contemplating •• the five million that we're contemplating advancing on top of the existing five, you would be in agreement with, you have no problem with that?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

That's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Charlie, just on that same line with repaving, just for my own edification, when you price it out, five million buys how many miles or ten million buys how many miles? And by the way, Portion Road came out great. County Road 16 is magnifique.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I'm not sure how much resurfacing we get for a million dollars. Jim Peterman, Assistant Chief Engineer and construction guru with the department can answer that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

You know, I just need to fill my head, I guess, with more useless trivia or whatever. I'm just curious.

MR. PETERMAN:

Good afternoon. My name is Jim Peterman, I'm the Assistant to Chief Engineer. It's very difficult to give you a price per mile. The existing condition of the roadway, how much drainage is required, if we have to mill, the thickness of asphalt that needs to go on, so just to give a specific dollar per mile would be very rough.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

What we can do is get back to you as far as resurfacing per lane with an inch and a half of

asphalt.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Obviously. I'm talking about average conditions not with any extraneous stuff, ballpark rule of thumb. I mean, if it's something that, you know, is not readily available now •• it's just something I'd be curious on going forward.

MR. PETERMAN:

I can get back to you on that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

That would be great. I appreciate that.

MR. PETERMAN:

Also, there's a lot of money spent on maintenance and protection of traffic, which is very site specific on the amount you need for each site.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. That's fine. Two other things, Charlie, if I can. The realignment of Rosevale and Gibbs Pond.

MR. PETERMAN:

We were going to have a public hearing at the end of July or beginning of August. It hasn't been scheduled yet, but that's what we're planning on setting that up for.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Let me know when that's going to be.

MR. PETERMAN:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So where are we at with that? Is there actual property that still need to be taken?

MR. PETERMAN:

Yeah. The public hearing will start the eminent domain procedure process. After the public hearing is held, it typically takes between two to two and a half years to actually acquire the property. Once we vest title to the property, we then can begin the work on the project.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So if you had the hearing in July of '05, you wouldn't anticipate actually constructing until '08?

MR. PETERMAN:

The end '07.

LEG. KENNEDY:

'07 or '08.

MR. PETERMAN:

Yeah. The end of '07 we would let the contract, and the spring of '08 we would probably begin construction.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right. Last question, I guess, from me for now, the reconstruction of the Riverhead Center, where is that at this point, and what do we expect for this year?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We have been forced to scale that project back because of the large increase in construction costs over the past year and a half. What we're doing •• there was a hold up with the fact the

it's a Wild and Scenic River designation there. And for the small addition on to the building, it was taking some time to get DEC approval. We believe •• we don't have the permit yet, but we believe that are able to satisfy all their requirements and we expect approval shortly. We are •• when I say scaling back the project, what we will be doing is replacing all the mechanical and HVAC systems, the lighting, the ceilings, all of the finishes. What we will not be doing are reprogramming the office space. Basically the walls will remain where they are, but everything refinished.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Really.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

And as far as bidding it, late this year we would expect to be able bid that.

LEG. O'LEARY:

If I may, through the Chair.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

With respect to the County Center, I'm going to get more specific and focus in on the Legislative Auditorium. We have made that a priority and moved some 1.5 into '05, what's your opinion concerning that?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

What you said ••

LEG. O'LEARY:

We're moving 1.5 into '05 specifically for the Legislative Auditorium.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I think that would be a good idea.

LEG. O'LEARY:

We're glad to hear that, because I certainly think it's a good idea too.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

You guys are right again. We would incorporate that into the project, yes. We have had conversations with Presiding Officer's Office, and we're prepared to move with that.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I think its 1.5, isn't it, Jim?

MR. SPERO:

That's the estimate we're going with right now, yeah.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And the other question I have is the escalator at the East County Center. The replacement of the lobby escalator with an elevator, what's the status of that?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

That would be part of the project, the escalator would be removed.

LEG. O'LEARY:

When?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I'm not sure. Are we actually replacing it with an elevator in the lobby?

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And what's the time table on that?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, that would be part of the overall project.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Part of the overall project.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The big project, yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. I mean, the fact that we've privatized the Legislative Auditorium, would that mean now that you'll move that up for purposes of construction and rehabilitation so to speak?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We'd have to look at it to see whether that could be more effectively done as a separate contract. We can't have too many contractors working in the building tripping over each other. But what you are saying is you want to see it done as early as possibly?

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yesterday. That's about as early •• as soon as possible, yes. That's the general consensus us of this body.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

While we're on the Riverhead County Center, what are the plans for the rest of the space as far as have you identified swing space, are you going to be doing everything while people remain there? What are you doing?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Swing space, we're trying •• will be minimized, the need for swing space. At one point, we were looking at quite a complex of trailers to move people into, but with the project scaled back where we're not taking walls down essentially, we will be able to conduct the work much more rapidly and keep people pretty much in place. We are arranging for some trailers to be part of the contract. It's a whole •• fairly complicated phasing of the work, because you can't just say let's do this piece of the building, you have to look at how the electrical and HVAC systems interrelate to that.

LEG. CARPENTER:

So is there any cosmetic work planned or you're basically doing???

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

There's a lot of cosmetic work; all the wall finishes and the floors, the ceilings, the lighting. Lighting is not only cosmetic, but it's an energy saver.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Right, exactly.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

A lot of the energy saving work is absolutely going forward, that includes the new glazing in the windows.

LEG. CARPENTER:

When are you scheduled to actually physically start?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Construction? Tedd, can you make a projections on that?

MR. GODEK:

As the Commissioner said earlier, we're planning on bidding this towards the end of the year. So as we get through the bid process and the contract execution, it probably will be late winter or early spring before we get into the meat of the project.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Is there a game plan for, you know, where you are starting first?

MR. GODEK:

We're working that out now as we speak. We're going through a whole phasing plan and investigation.

LEG. CARPENTER:

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just two other questions with that. So then if you're looking to let the bid at the end of the year, then you have a finalized set of plans at this point that everybody is actually on board with?

MR. GODEK:

No. We are working on those plans now.

LEG. KENNEDY:

With the various different offices in the building as far as getting their final needs and requirements and things such as that?

MR. GODEK:

Yes. When get the phasing worked out, we will probably have a presentation made to all of the users groups in the building to get everybody on board generally, and then we'll have specific sessions with the individual user groups to work out any minor details.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The other question that I have is practically speaking, if you're no longer going to rip into the existing shell, but you're going to try to work with the interior configuration and space yet still have to take out that ventilation system, which is a horror show, take out all the wiring and take out all of the other guts and plumbing work and things like that, aren't you going to displace staff in the process of doing that?

MR. GODEK:

We will be, yes. There's no question about that. We're trying to minimize that through some •• some good thought out phasing.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I appreciate what you are saying there, but having had the pleasure of being there for eight weeks, I know that that ductwork proliferates all over the place and is in horrible shape, the electrical system was outdated ten years ago, and a lot of that is embedded, I think, in a lot of the interior walls and stuff. That's all going to have to be ripped, right?

MR. GODEK:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

MR. GODEK:

A good portion of that is in the ceiling, which we intend to pretty much wholesale replace throughout the building.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What about the exiting UPS systems that in there, are you going to take them out and put them back in or will they not have to be touched.

MR. GODEK:

Let me call on my associate.

MR. LAGUARDIA:

Good afternoon. We plan to replace the data processing ops, which is the main op that distributes power throughout most of the building, and individual users, depending on the condition of their existing ops, we'll just rewire their ops back into the new electrical system. Or if it's necessarily, we'll provide additional ops to replace ••

LEG. KENNEDY:

Does the plan have a placement or a provision for media center or a data center at this point

similar to what had been there previously when IS was upstairs there?

MR. LAGUARDIA:

IS's center is going to remain as is where it is with some minor renovations as requested by IS.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Will that be enough •• will that be sufficient to accommodate the balance of the offices? I mean, I can only speak from where it came from, what about the Clerk's Office.

MR. LAGUARDIA:

My understanding is there is some controversy between the Clerk and

IS ••

LEG. KENNEDY:

Outstanding.

MR. LAGUARDIA:

•• whether there is a separate center need. We generally take our direction from IS. IS believes that center they have is sufficient.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Have you heard from any of the other offices that out there like Real Property or like the Treasurer's Office vis a vis the media center?

MR. LAGUARDIA:

A separate media center •• as far as I know, they're happy with what IS has provided.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right. That's all I have for now.

LEG. CARPENTER:

May I?

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Just to pick up on what he's saying. So you've had •• have had meetings with the various users of the building for their input before you move forward with this?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, we have had extensive meetings, but remember what I said earlier that we are no longer reprogramming the space. A lot of those meetings were directed toward reprogramming of this space.

LEG. CARPENTER:

So are you planning future meetings since it seems that rest the project has been changed dramatically?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

As Tedd said, when we have the phasing clearly established, we will meet with them, because that will obviously have an impact on their operations, and we'll explain that to them.

LEG. CARPENTER:

What is the exact amount of money that it came in over that has caused you to alter the design and what you plan on doing?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

It was never actually bid, but the cost escalation in 2004, was approximately 12 to 13% in the building industry. The project was •• it was a already tight budget, so we estimated we were two and a half to \$3 million short of being able to do the project; is that correct, Tedd?

MR. GODEK:

Yes.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Do you think that it's worth two and a half to \$3 million to now go in this other direction? It is really in the long run going to be cost effective and cost efficient to go this way than the way you had originally planned?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We think it will be, because it's going to address the most cost conscious items; the installation of the building, the windows, the electrical system, lighting. Those are all big energy savers, so we believe •• as well as the HVAC system will be much more efficient. So we believe that we will be saving money in the operating cost and will be providing a much nicer environment for people to work with the aesthetic improvements we'll be making.

LEG. CARPENTER:

And are the space needs going to be adequately addressed?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Tedd.

MR. GODEK:

The space needs will be addressed to the point that they will have available to them what they have now with some minor exceptions. There are some Health Department areas up on the second floor that are vacating into the south wing. We'll have those available to us to distribute, so to speak, amongst the other user groups. However, there will not be the wholesale shifting around of departments that we originally anticipated. Given the fact that we weren't doing a large expansion to the building to begin with, we weren't covering everybody's needs at 100% even under the old project.

LEG. CARPENTER:

And now you are probably not covering their needs at all or minimally if you're not adding any space and you're working within the configuration of the existing building.

MR. GODEK:

We will be working with the existing space that we have available to us now.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Except for the Clerk's area, there is an addition in the Clerk's area, correct?

MR. GODEK:

Yeah. We're putting on the additional storage space for the Clerk, that's the addition you referenced earlier.

LEG. CARPENTER:

So anyone that really felt they need additional space is getting nothing.

MR. GODEK:

Other than, like I said, some Health Department space that will become available to us.

LEG. CARPENTER:

Do you have any idea how much that square footage is?

MR. GODEK:

Off hand I do not at this point, no.

LEG. CARPENTER:

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just to go down a little bit further with some understanding with this, in the process of doing a project, are you going to have to do any abatement work in there, or is that something that's dealt with previously?

MR. LAGUARDIA:

Yes, there will be abatement work that has to be done.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So you're going to have asbestos abatement that being done in the building, and we're going to have people that are there in the building working?

MR. LAGUARDIA:

Yes, as we do on a routine basis. When you were in that building, we had many, many asbestos projects.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I remember the Dennison Building too. What are you going to do with the liber section down where, you know, a lot of the libers and books are in the back there where the title people work? Is that going to under go any type of rehabilitation in there, and are they going to be displaced at all?

MR. GODEK:

The liber section, in order to maintain that operation going on a five day a week basis uninterrupted, we're going to have to do the renovations that we anticipate doing around them. We're going to have to keep them up and running. We'll be doing that work probably on premium time in the evenings. And we will be doing some renovation work in there, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Primarily, what, you're going to replace the windows, you're going to do lighting, you're going to do maybe some wall treatments?

MR. GODEK:

Pretty much in keeping with what we're doing throughout the rest of the building.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I realize several of you have history there and some unique interests. If you would like, we'd be glad sit down with you and go over the plans.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just having seen some many previous sets of them and sat there as far as, you know, looking at different things as far as title searches space and proposed child care space and who is going to be where and this, that and the other thing, it would be interesting to see what this latest iteration is.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Commissioner, I don't have any specific interests or special interests on that building particularly, just I've been here around the discussions for years about doing it. I guess the curiosity is if you are two million short, why not come to the Legislature ask for two million to do the original project as originally planned so you don't have to scale back so needs are met and it's done right the first time?

My concern is doing •• we have had scale backs, and a big example is Cohalan Court Complex. We can just, you know, lop off a few floors of the building and now we're all happy. The problem is that now they need the few floors back now. And to do, the expense of doing a few floors would be astronomical. It's a lot easier and a lot cheaper no matter how much more it costs because of inflation, you know, the inflationary figures on construction costs. It's a lot cheaper and a lot easier to do it when you do it and you just ask for the extra money. I'm just curious why that wasn't one of the options that we've sat down and talked about or tried to chew over. Why didn't you want to go that route?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, that was the DASNY solution that you referred to with respect to the Cohalan Court Complex.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

I didn't blame you.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

That's okay. I had to get my shot in.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

It more just •• what's happens often is when we scale back, we do a lot of scaling back on things when we realize we're a little short, we're a lot short, and sometimes it's best to complete the project as originally designed. So the curiosity is why not.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, the department's budget request did include three and a half million dollars, you know, our submission in January or February of this year for this project.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

I would have added that, but I figured I'd let you.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We also recognize the County's involvement in a number of very large projects now, most notable the jail, so.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

As the Public Works Commissioner, I'll put you in a difficult position, do you see that •• the scale

backs that we were doing, are they something •• are they the things that are really needed? In other words, do we need these things in this building? It is important to us? Is it something that we are going to have revisit? I'm not going to revisit, I'm not going to be here. But there are going to be people that are coming behind me that are going to end up revisiting this stuff. And the inflationary cost of that will be astronomical because of the difficulty in doing those things which we scale back if they're eventually needed, and secondarily, just because of inflation and higher cost to do it.

So should we be looking at here •• my concern is that this thing is going to implode some when you try to scale back, and it might not be a project that you really want to do, you'll just do it more piecemeal and not in the way you want to do it when you don't have the correct funds to accomplish your goals. And is it something that the Legislature should be looking at? If you don't say it •• I mean, I know you're the proverbial rock and a hard place, but if you don't say it and if you don't tell us that that's something we should look at, then we're not going to look at. That's really what it's going to come down to.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I think that this is a responsible scale back. It's not •• we're doing the important things here. Public Works' interest has been the HVAC system because it's been very uncomfortable building for the users. In spite of our best efforts, there were things we couldn't address with respect to the humidity and the temperatures. So that will absolutely be addressed now. The building will be much more energy efficient. I mean, that building was designed when fuel was 12 cents a gallon.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

The things you are doing are important. It's not a question of things that you are doing, it's the things you are not doing that I'm concerned about.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The building itself, the aesthetics of it will be a much more pleasant work place, but it won't be as efficient ergonomically for the employees and the functions of the offices. However, we regularly get requests from departments to change the alignment of their offices and make changes. So what was agreed to a year and a half or two years ago by the users groups, if we went to them a year from now or even now, they probably would have a different arrangement. So I don't think there's any long term loss or long term inefficiency that we're doing here.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Charlie, I'm going to have to go ahead, I guess, and disagree with you in a couple of areas. Having been through this and having had some of those requests from the department and the accommodations met, you guys did wonderful work in there from where it was really almost medieval when I first got out there to the point where the environment was upgrade somewhat, but from a design perspective as far as facilitating public foot traffic, which is what that building has a tremendous amount of, it does not lend itself to easy ingress and egress on the ground floor. And certainly, you know, notwithstanding the escalator or non escalator, the second floor does not really allow itself for the regular citizen to get in and out there, let alone handicapped individuals. And that's oftentimes the things that we had to deal with as far as trying to go ahead service folks that were in, you know, wheelchairs or what have you. There was always that aspect of it where it provided, you know, some accomodation for •• for us, and we made as best we can do from the work side.

The other thing I will say to you too with the climate comfort, obviously it needs to be addressed, not only for the benefit for employees, though. Some of the times there when we would have those humidity melt•downs, you couldn't use the equipment, you couldn't scan, you couldn't go ahead and do any of the other things you needed to do as far as imaging, all the printers would go ahead and curl up, the documents themselves would fold right over, and you couldn't work with them. So it didn't just impact, you know, our experiences as employees for a seven hour day or an eight hour day in the building, it made it impossible to work.

So I would go back again, and I would kind of echo what the Chairman was saying and come back to you from my seat now and ask you do you think we're saving three and forfeiting what may be a significant amount of money down the road as far as, you know, doing the project the way it was originally envisioned?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, the items you ended on are being addressed; the humidity and temperatures, those items are absolutely being addressed. The items you started with are not being addressed, and frankly, I'm not sure they were being •• as far as the public entrance to the building and that sort of thing, I'm not sure that was going to be addressed.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I don't so much mean the entrance to the building. Obviously, after 9/11, we had to do things that dealt with security, and those were done well. And I imagine that, you know, even with renovating the auditorium there may be some modification of it, I don't know what. But I know there was some discussion as you would go up and down the main hall to get access to our recording counters and some of the other, you know, public information areas to open up what were basically just very small pigeon•holed doorways that allowed you into interior areas where we have some of our work counters. How that materialized, I don't know, I've been away from it

for, you know, a better part of almost a year.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

As Chairman Binder put very well, I am between a rock and a hard place right here. I did indicate that our request did include three and a half million dollars to do the project as anticipated. So I'm not going to argue against that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

As then as the Commissioner of Public Works you saw from your engineering expertise and knowledge of municipal buildings and access that there was merit and value to that?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

That's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Excellent. Good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just an observation, and I'm a bit troubled by what I perceive to be a correlation between scale backs of major capital projects and the jail. It just seems to me that •• I would hate to think that that's the reason why the Riverhead Center was scaled back, because of the anticipated costs associated with the jail. Would you care to comment on that? Forget it. Forget it.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

I think you got your comment, Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I think he got the point. I mean, we're putting monies •• we're advancing monies with respect to the auditorium with hopefully no scale back there, but maybe we ought to consider advancing more monies for the County Center. I think Legislator Kennedy has raised some very valid points. I don't want to see something that's going to impact not only the general public, but the county employees as well on scaling back a project because of other controlling factors. It just seems to me that that is just the wrong approach.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Basically, you should list the transcript as Chairman Bartha and then colon and then blank, just leave it •• just leave it like that.

LEG. CARPENTER:

May I?

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Carpenter.

LEG. CARPENTER:

I think too, there was much discussion and apprehension about appropriating the dollars when we did this project. And I think a majority of us and consensus of opinion at the time was it's a seat of County Government. You know, it's where the Legislature meets, it's where the public comes, and it should be a professional, respectful, dignified environment, especially for the employees. And certainly the Riverhead County Center is even on a larger scale in the fact of the amount of public traffic that goes in there in all of various entities. And I think that for us to be •• I don't want to say not pinching pennies, because I think that's something that we as Legislators who have a fiscal responsibility to the people that we represent in this County want to maximize every single last penny, but I do think that we owe it to the residents of this County to provide a County Center that is what it should be and not scaled back because of another project, because this County Center has not been touched in a bazillion years. And if we're going to do it, we should do it and do it right.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The only thing I would just like to say again is that the building, if you proceed with the project that I'm referring to as scaled back project, the building will appear the same to the general public whether we went with the scaled back project or the originally contemplated project.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

What is the difference? What won't it have that you would have originally ••

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

What it won't have are the realignment of the interior office space.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Which means extra square feet.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The interior office space would still be redone and refinished. It would not be realigned consistent with the programs that the user groups wanted; some offices may be smaller, some offices may be bigger, they may be grouped differently under the new •• under their wish list. It's going to stay the way it is now.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Commissioner, it can't be three million dollars to move walls. So my guess is that there's build out, there's a lot more build out that would have been done in terms of space, raw space. You're just moving walls you are saying for three million dollars?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Tedd.

MR. GODEK:

In fact, there is a lot of money involved in moving the walls. Just quickly, you used the expression additional space, we weren't picking up any additional space under the big project, nor are we picking up any additional space under the smaller project. It was a realignment of space. As I said earlier, we weren't doing any additions to that building with the exception of the record storage addition.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Explain to me three million so I can understand the difference between the project as you're planning now with the scale back and what it would have been if you had all your wishes and you has all the money you needed, the original request of the department at three and a half million. What's the difference in the project? Give the specific differences so we can understand it here, because if we don't understand it, we can't talk about it in terms of making any changes. I mean, we might not add, it might be a waste of that extra money. Now that's what I need to know.

MR. GODEK:

What's involved in the three and a half million dollars is the demolition of existing construction.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

You're talking support walls, you are talking actual hard walls, they're not •• these are not soft moveables or???

MR. GODEK:

No. These are hard walls.

MR. GODEK:

We're then rebuilding those in different locations. What that involves is, for instance, all new doors, new doors, new frames. We would have been doing a lot of work to the bathrooms in realignment and so on. We intend to refinish the toilet areas under this project, but they will be the same toilet areas that you are accustomed to seeing specially.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

That's the three million? If that's the three million ••

MR. GODEK:

I'm probably not putting it across as properly as I should, but three and a half million runs up real quick.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Okay. Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Just quickly, Tedd, when you're saying that the basic footprint is going to remain intact, there's going to be no expansion of the building, all the repairs and renovations are going to occur within the existing frame?

MR. GODEK:

That's correct. With the exception •• with the exception of the record storage addition down by the Kinsealla wing, which is •• you know, what was occurring then is occurring now.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The record storage area, the last set of plans that I saw, which was probably about 14 months or so ago, did realign some of the external foot traffic out there, particularly after there had been the security entrance put in place. As you guys all know now, if you have to Court Actions on the north exterior part of the building •• and I thought that there was some routing that was going to be able to occur, some interior routing for the public that would keep it away from the internal employee work area.

MR. GODEK:

In fact, we were looking into that. We are aware of that short coming and looking to solve it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So you were going to try to accommodate that even with this scaled back plan?

MR. GODEK:

If we can.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. My other recollection is that there was additional interior work space that was being picked up, vis a vis some of the cubicle searcher areas. There's two separate areas now. And I thought there was going to be a combined accomodation •• one of the sets of plans I saw. I did see a lot of different sets of plans. What's going to happen with that under this, you know, scaled back version, this economy version?

MR. GODEK:

Are you referring to the title searchers?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

MR. GODEK:

Okay. We'll be providing space in the existing area they are in now for a number of title searchers, and I'm not involved with •• directly with exactly how many we're going to end up with, but as soon as somebody gives me the number, that's what we'll accommodate. But they'll still basically be in the same area.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So two areas now •• I know there's two areas now where there's 66 cubicles. In this plan going forward, you anticipate that you are going to have two areas or some area that's going to deal with some type title searchers?

MR. GODEK:

We're looking to consolidate that operation and in doing so provide more public access space.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thanks. All right.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

All right. I'm comfortable with the scale back if you are. It sounds like it's just interior walls.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I just have one final question.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

The scale back in term of dollars, how much is the estimates dollar figure for the scale back that's occurring?

MR. GODEK:

We anticipate working within the existing budget, which is, I believe, currently somewhere between 29 and \$30 million.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. And that's been scaled back to what or from what?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The budget itself hasn't been scaled back.

LEG. O'LEARY:

It hasn't?

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

The request has been scaled back. You were going to request three million more.

MR. GODEK:

We were going to request 3.5 on top of that.

LEG. O'LEARY:

The cost increased, and that wasn't in the proposed budget?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. I understand.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Let me ask you about another project. We'll get off that for a minute. 5095, the reconstruction of CR 11, Pulaski Road from Larkfield Road to New York State Road 25 A. Budget Review, their evaluation of this •• I know, I'm going to get in trouble, I'm talking about a roadway in someone else's district, but these are the things I get in trouble for. The section of roadway has not been updated since its original construction during the 1940s. Now, the 1940s are really a long time ago. World War II.

MR. PETERMAN:

Major reconstruction. It has been resurfaced in some areas. But the basic footprint of the roadway hasn't been ••

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Right. So what Budget Review is telling us here is that they think we should restore a million dollars for land acquisition and \$7 million for construction in the subsequent years. Why do you think you can do it with a lot less, and why has the program slipped a year, at least one year, I mean, really say a year, but it's •• I think, it's at least one year it slipped to 2010? I mean, this is a project that really needs to be done.

MR. PETERMAN:

It's a very large project that we actually created into two phases; phase one being the railroad bridge that the money is in the Capital Program for, and phase two, which would be the roadwork end of it from Larkfield to 25 A, we set aside the bridge.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Why is it just so scaled back is the question.

MR. PETERMAN:

It was a \$12 million project combined.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

It's actually being put into phases rather than scaled back.

MR. PETERMAN:

That's correct. The money •• we had asked for the money for both phases. I believe only the money for phase one is included in the Capital Program right now. Which the bridge is the most important thing to get reconstructed out there now.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Right. Budget Review, just let me ask you on your •• your feeling was that we should restore a million for land acquisition and seven million for construction. I assume you looked at the splitting of the project, you know, with the bridge or may be this is more one of those never minds.

MR. SPERO:

The program is a planning document. The project cost as requested was \$13.6 million. So it's our feeling that the program should reflect the work that needs to be done on the road.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Right. I guess that's the question. Is it 13 million that needs to be done on the road, or that other seven million is the bridge? It doesn't make a lot of sense to me. It seems to me that we need •• we need money for the roadway, which would be •• could be, you know, over \$10 million just for the road part of the it.

MR. PETERMAN:

It's about \$7 million.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Just the road part of it. So you are fine with this. You're going to be able to do this considering price escalations into the future? You are comfortable that you are going to be able to get this project done, all the roadwork done at the number you are looking?

MR. PETERMAN:

As far as the seven million in subsequent years for the roadwork?

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Right. The way you have •• right. Subsequent years.

MR. PETERMAN:

Depending how far subsequent years goes into the future, you know.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Well, it depends on when you are getting the roadwork done. I'd love you to get it done next year or even this year. Right. 2006 would be great because it needs to be done. It's a bad •• it's a bad road, so it needs to be done.

LEG. ALDEN:

Before November.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

November would be good, would be good. Though it's not in my district, I have some interest. Another one not in my district is Project 5510, County share for the reconstruction of CR 3, Pinelawn Road, Town of Huntington. Budget Review Office does agree with your presentation. I'm just curious why again it's slipping back or rescheduling back. Where is the project? The reason I'm asking really is because 110 and Pinelawn Road and this whole area is of critical importance to people being able to move in Huntington. And even with this fixed, I don't know how much it's going to help, but the truth is this whole area is an absolute nightmare to drive.

MR. PETERMAN:

And we agree. It really has a lot to do with the availability of federal aid in the program. The County only usually receives about \$13 million in federal aid for all our projects.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

We could use it all here.

MR. PETERMAN:

You could use a lot more than that here. We have had a public informational meeting on this project. The basic input that we received from the informational meeting was that the intersection of Ruland Road was the main crux of the problem, which we knew of.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

There's new buildings there, there's new •• there has been development down in that area so it's making it worse.

MR. PETERMAN:

And the capacity. There's a capacity accident problem at that intersection. We're looking to scale the big project down to that intersection improvement so we can get the money in the tip for this project. We're ready to proceed into preliminary design on that right now.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Okay. Nothing else for that area, 110, Pinelawn Road, Old Country Road?

MR. PETERMAN:

No.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Okay. Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Hi, Jim. With respect to 5516, CR 80 project, Montauk Highway, William Floyd to Barnes, when can I anticipate or expect the resolution submission for the maps and findings and initiating eminent domain process? Does Bill want to answer that?

MR. PETERMAN:

Bill has been a little bit more involved in that.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Hi, Bill. The question is when can I anticipate the submission of the resolution initiating eminent domain process with the submission of the maps and findings for the project 5516, CR 80 project, William Floyd to Barnes?

MR. HILLMAN:

We will be scheduling a meeting with the consultant to finalize the subsequent investigations.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay.

MR. HILLMAN:

And when we hold that meeting, we would have a recommendation shortly after that. I would anticipate mid June to the later part of June to be able to advise you better on that.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay. Would I be apprised of when you're meeting with the consultant and the results shortly thereafter?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes, you would.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

just a quick question. Who does the filing for the condemnations, the County Attorney or do you hire outside counsel to do that?

MR. PETERMAN:

The filing of the final deeds after vesting?

LEG. ALDEN:

The whole process.

MR. PETERMAN:

To file for the public hearing?

LEG. ALDEN:

All of it.

MR. PETERMAN:

The request for public hearing come here, to hold the public hearing.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right. But you have to file it with the court too.

MR. PETERMAN:

That would be our Condemnation Unit that's now in DPW.

LEG. ALDEN:

You have attorneys working in DPW?

MR. PETERMAN:

No. We have the real estate appraiser.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

It's a group of people that had been with Real Estate and were transferred to us in last year's budget.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Terry and others.

LEG. ALDEN:

It's a Supreme Court action ••

LEG. KENNEDY:

They're not filing summonses and complaints.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We've worked with the County Attorney's Office on this, so I don't believe they've used outside counsel.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. I didn't know if you hired outside counsel.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We can check on that and let you know.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Any other questions? Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Just one more project, 5039, Townline Road. I see that BRO recommends that we move up 500,000 that had been thrown back to '07 and move it into '06. You're going to actually do some •• what kind of work are you going to do there by the intersection with Hoffman?

MR. PETERMAN:

The intersection, if you know the area well, there's some sight distance problems there, both horizontal and vertical. There will be some •• there will be four takings involved with the triangular piece on each corner to increase the radiuses especially for school buses in that area.

LEG. KENNEDY:

There's a tremendous amount of traffic coming in and out of there for the elementary school.

MR. PETERMAN:

That's correct. There's also a vertical profile that if you're doing the •• you don't have proper sight distance vertically coming over the hill.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Do you •• in other words, do you feel that by moving that into '06 you are going to be able to go ahead and move •• are you in a position to be able to go ahead and do some work on that in '06?

MR. PETERMAN:

It depends if the right-of-way is determined to be de minimus. If a right-of-way taking is determined to be de minimus, the whole procedure can be expedited. We feel this could be de

minus since it's not going to impact the property itself.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And I mean de minus, basically we're talking about, like, what, 10 feet or less?

MR. PETERMAN:

Ten foot •• like ten foot by •• or 15 feet by 15 feet triangular piece of property does not adversely affect the value of the parcel itself, the existing parcel. We do not •• Public Works does not make that determination. That will be done at the appraisal point.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN BINDER:

Any other questions for DPW? If not, thanks for coming. Amendments have to be in by tomorrow, tomorrow close of business. So that's just letting members know. I appreciate you coming. There are no comments from the committee that I can hear of. So I'll make a motion to adjourn, seconded by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? We are adjourned.

(* THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:08 P.M. *)

_ _ **DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY**